DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 430 SP 027 710

AUTHOR Koehler, Virginia Richardson
TITLE The Instructional Supervision of Student Teachers.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (70th; San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Higher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teaching; *Supervisory Training; *Teacher Role; Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a literature review relating to the instructional supervision of student teachers and a description of a study relating to student teacher supervision. Data from the review and study, which involved the observation of 14 student teaching experiences, indicate that student teaching is the most important aspect of preservice teacher education. However, not enough attention is paid to the role cooperating teachers have in influencing student teachers and setting up models for the student teachers to follow. There is a great need for articulate and consciously reflective cooperating teachers for the student teaching experience. Cooperating teachers need to be able to analyze and articulate the ways in which their students have been socialized into the classroom routines and the effect of this socialization on the student teacher's performance. Schools must understand their roles not only as reflective and self-renewing places, but also as places for beginning teachers and student teachers to become socialized into such settings. In this way schools could become ideal places for student teaching and could, thereby, achieve the goal of helping to empower the teaching profession through well educated and socialized new teachers. A five-page reference list is appended. (CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS

ED271430

Virginia Richardson Koehler

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. R. Koehler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP027710

Virginia Richardson Koehler
University of Arizona

THE INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHERS[1]

I INTRODUCTION

The student teaching process, described as the most important component in the preparation of teachers (Brimfield and Leonard, 1983), was designed to provide a bridge between the campus-based academic programs and life in the classroom as a fully-prepared classroom teacher. Educators and scholars feel that it is extremely important (Haberman, 1984), and teachers in their first several years of teaching report that it was, indeed, the most important experience in their preservice preparation (Davies and Amarshek, 1969). While all acknowledge the importance of the experience, a number of scholars caution that the student teaching component can have negative as well as positive consequences on student teachers (Hull, 1981; Zeichner, 1980).

The instructional supervision literature provides a set of models for the supervision of inservice teachers and may be useful in helping cooperating teachers and university supervisors work with student teachers. Unfortunately the small amount of research that has been conducted on supervision and its impact on instruction is discouraging. Blumberg (1980), for example, concluded: "it seems clear to me that the work of supervisors, by whatever name they go, has had little effect in raising the quality of instruction in systems as a whole" (p. 234). The literature does, however, highlight the importance of the context in which supervision takes place. Blumberg suggests that we focus on the schools as the unit of change rather than on teachers as individuals.

This context may also be an important consideration in the supervision of student teaching--a specialized type of supervision. The emphasis in most teacher education programs is on the triad (student teacher, cooperating teacher and university supervisor) as the important instructional entity. Few pay attention to problems and potential of the school in affecting the student teaching experience.

To explore the potential importance of context in the student teaching experience, two literatures will be reviewed: instructional supervision and research on student teaching. The analysis will also include insights gained from a participant

---

[1]This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association, San Francisco, 1986.

SP 021 710

observation study of fourteen student teaching experiences. The purpose of the paper is to develop research-based ways of thinking about the improvement of student teaching.

11 INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION

Most books on instructional supervision commence with a relatively long chapter on the various definitions and the history of supervision, and the many roles that include a supervisory function. Beyond this chapter, there is little else that belongs exclusively to a domain called supervision. The topics relate to school organization and management, teacher observation and evaluation, staff development, and effective instruction. (One possible exception to this is the work on supervisory feedback sessions--a topic that is shared with the improvement-oriented teacher evaluation literature.) Supervision, therefore, is not really a 'field'. It is a function that is embedded within or overlaps with major domains such as school organization and management, and teacher evaluation.

An important dimension on which formal definitions of supervision vary concerns authority; that is, whether the supervisor has authority over the supervisee. Harris (1985), for example, does not acknowledge authority in his definition. He views supervision as a function, not a role or task. "Supervision of instruction is what school personnel do with adults and things to maintain or change a school operation in ways that directly influence the teaching processes employed to improve learning. . . .directed toward improving the teaching-learning processes of the school" (p. 10). Neagley and Evans (1980) define supervision "as a service for teachers that eventually results in improving instruction, learning, and the curriculum. It consists of positive, dynamic, democratic actions designed to improve instruction through the continued growth of all concerned individuals--the child, the teacher, the supervisor, the administrator, and the parent or other lay person." (p. 20) These definitions include anything related to the improvement of instruction as supervision, including staff and curriculum development.

On the other hand, Alfonso, Firth and Neville (1981) define supervision as overseeing or directing the work of others, advancing the work effectiveness of individuals or groups: "to assist the supervisor, the organization assigns an appropriate measure of status and formal authority" (p. 4). And Lucio and McNeil (1979) define supervision as "a superior perspective attained by special preparation and position" (p. viii).

It is understandable that many authors exclude authority from their definitions of supervision. Blumberg (1980) describes the relationship between teachers and supervisors (persons with authority) as a "cold war. . . . "Neither side trusts the other and each side is convinced of a cold war". (p. 5). Blumberg provides ample research evidence of the perceptions of the standoff between teachers and their supervisors, and the debilitating feelings on both sides. Defining supervision more

broadly allows the authors to ignore the conflict between the helping and evaluation functions of a supervisor in an authority position in an organization with strong egalitarian norms among its workers. This conflict and these norms contribute to rendering supervision time-consuming and largely ineffective.

A second dimension along which formal definitions of supervision differ involves the degree to which the supervisee takes initiative and responsibility for analyzing problems and determining solutions. This distinction is generally called direct vs. indirect feedback; but goes much further into basic principles concerning the treatment of teaching as a profession, teachers as adults responsible for their own judgments and decisions in the classroom, and the ways in which professionals change their behavior. The clinical supervision literature amply demonstrates the second approach, and perhaps was developed, in part, as an antidote to the "cold war" problems described by Blumberg.

Clinical supervision consists of a set of values related to the dignity and worth of the individual teacher and the best ways of helping a teacher change, and a set of processes that includes thorough recording and collaborative analysis of classroom events (see Goldhammer, 1969; Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski, 1980; Smyth, 1984). Trust between the supervisor and teacher is an important ingredient in clinical supervision, as is the active participation of the teacher in identifying areas needing improvement and potential solutions to the problems. Some advocates of clinical supervision also emphasize the needs of the supervisor: that is, the supervisor needs to experience professional growth as well as the teacher. (Blumberg, 1980; Bird, 1984).

While teachers and administrators agree with the basic assumptions of clinical supervision (Eaker, 1982), the quality and quantity of research on clinical supervision does not allow one to conclude that clinical supervision affects the quality of instruction (see Sullivan, 1980; and Acheson and Gall, 1980). And others have suggested that clinical supervision simply does not fit the reality of most schools (McFaul & Cooper, 1984). Building trust for purposes of collaborative problem-solving is extremely time consuming--a commodity not in great supply for administrators (see Kmetz and Willower, 1982; and Martin & Willower, 1981, for detailed descriptions of how elementary and secondary principals spend their time). It is therefore not clear that effectively and appropriately implemented clinical supervision will become widespread in practice.

Further, clinical supervision does not account for the norms of school faculties. As Little (1981) has pointed out, the norms of interaction among faculty members affect how changes take place and new ideas are introduced. While there are minor differences among norms from school to school, there are some prevailing beliefs held by teachers that strongly affect the nature of supervision and other management functions. Lortie (1978) describes the ethos of school faculties as consisting of

three aspects: conservatism, individualism, and presentism. This, he feels, is due in large part to the anxiety surrounding the uncertainty about classroom outcomes, and the lack of an agreed-upon professional knowledge base. Differences in practice are therefore viewed as "matters of philosophy" judged by considerations of personal preference rather than through the application of more scientific evaluative procedures (Metz, 1978). The individualism norm implies little reliance on others for sources of knowledge, skills, or experience except during the first two years (Fuchs, 1969). Requests for help or advice would be admitting failure. Trial and error and individual personalities are the bases for developing good practice. Since students, circumstances and personalities of teachers differ, there is a tolerance for widely differing practice as well as strong egalitarian norms. While the concept of the improvement of practice is accepted, it is accepted within a framework of individual teacher experimentation and judgment. Lortie suggests that the "built-in resistance to change [may be due to the belief] that their work environment has never permitted them to show what they really can do" (p.235). Therefore, the introduction of another adult into the judgment process, particulary a supervisor in an authority position, involves the breaking of a strongly held norm.

IV RECENT APPROACHES TO CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Two recent approaches to supervision have begun to address the problems in the implementation of clinical supervision.

The first emphasizes the development and specification of the technical aspects of supervision. In an attempt to reduce the complexity and ambiguities inherent in supervision, a model of the content and processes of observation and feedback is prescribed. Madeline Hunter is the major proponent of such an approach to supervision. She specifies the nine components of a good lesson (Russell and Hunter, 1980), how to conduct a preobservation session with the teacher, how to take observation notes, and how to conduct different types of post observation conferences (Hunter, 1985). While this model is rapidly being adopted by school districts across the nation, there is a paucity of evidence that it improves the quality of supervision. Anecdotal evidence indicates that while administrators and teachers are quick to adopt the model, they soon tire of its inflexible routines. In other words, experiencing growth while using such a model is difficult since the model and its training mechanisms emphasize a relatively inflexible set of processes rather than ways of thinking about supervision and teaching. The model, therefore, does not empower the supervisor or teacher to adapt it or attain a continuing level of intellectual pleasure in understanding more about teaching and supervision.

A related approach (albeit with several major differences) to observation and feedback has been developed by Joyce and Showers (1980, 1981, 1982). "Coaching", as it is called, is not

described by Joyce and Showers as a supervision technique. They see it as a change implementation model in that it addresses the problem of the transfer of skills from an inservice or preservice classroom to implementation in the classroom. Defined as "hands-on, in-classroom assistance with the transfer of skills and strategies to the classroom" (Joyce and Showers, 1981, p. 380), coaching is characterized by an observation and feedback cycle in an ongoing instructional or clinical situation. The major difference between coaching and the observation-feedback cycle in clinical supervision, then, is that in coaching, the skills constituting a new approach to classroom teaching have been specified and agreed upon in advance. Coaching centers on the match between intended use of knowledge and skills with understandings and techniques actually employed. Clinical supervision, however, involves a collaborative approach toward specifying areas needing improvement. Further, coaching was not developed for use, exclusively, by supervisors in an administrative position; peer teachers are encouraged to coach each other.

A major difference between the Hunter and the Showers/Joyce approaches to observation-feedback is that the coaching model has received empirical research attention by the developers. In a well-designed experimental study, Showers (1982 and 1983) found that coached teachers were better able to integrate specific models of teaching into their repertoires than their counterparts who had not been coached. Baker and Showers (1984) investigated the long-term effects of coaching, and found that coached teachers were better able to retain and transfer knowledge and skills acquired through prior training.

Showers (1983) went further in her analyses to determine why some teachers benefited from coaching more than others. She found that the structure of the schools in which teachers worked could constrain the transfer of training. In interviews with the teachers, she found that those who made an effort to share their experiences with other teachers and the principals felt that they received encouragement; teachers who did not felt that they only received encouragement from their students. The schools did not have formal procedures for ongoing discussions about curriculum and instruction. Further, she found that a teacher's cognitions and conceptual level were important in determining the degree to which coaching affected his/her performance. "Teachers who were positive toward the content and process of the training and were willing to practice the new models of teaching in their classrooms but who could not think conceptually about what they taught and how they taught it had difficulty in using the models, other than as fun, singular activities unrelated to their mainstream instruction" (p. 26).

A second approach to the implementation of clinical supervision involves school-wide efforts and the "breaking of norms". Showers (1983) hinted at the problem of the individual teacher who does not receive encouragement from peer or principal. Blumberg (1980) was more explicit in stating his

concerns about the future of clinical supervision of individual teachers, and the need for a school-wide focus on improvement. In a remarkable final chapter in his book on supervision, Blumberg expressed "self-doubt about the importance of his work" (p. 233). He concluded "that the traditional one-on-one focus of supervision in the schools. . .has no future", and that we need to "rethink the problem of improving instruction so that it is not associated primarily with teachers as individuals but with schools as normative, organic systems." (p. 234).

Bird and Little (Bird, 1984, Little, 1981; Bird and Little, 1983) are more explicit about the need to break the norms in a school setting to allow for clinical supervision, defined by Bird (1984) as "rigorous analysis of teaching", to take place. He suggests that the partner (supervisor, peer, principal) must assert status with regard to the teacher's work. The supervisor/teacher relationship also requires reciprocity, which, as defined by Little (1981) involves a combination of equality of effort, an exchange of benefits and a particular manner in the discussions of a teacher's performance. This manner includes humility in the face of the complexity of the problem, a focus on practice rather than competence, and deference on the part of the teacher to the assertions made by the partner. Bird points out that very few schools have favorable conditions for the analysis of teaching which is a brand new task for schools. At least initially, he suggests, it is the principal who must work to break through the norms because of the existing and latent status differences between principal and teacher. An instructional leadership role for the principal, then, would include, as a major function, the rigorous analysis of teaching.

III STUDENT TEACHING

Researchers as well as university supervisors feel that the cooperating teacher is the most important element in the student teaching component. It is the cooperating teacher, Morrisey (1980) stated, "who helps the student teacher put into practice all the theory taught" (p. 11). It is also agreed that the cooperating teacher is more influential than the university supervisor (Yee, 1969; Seperson & Joyce, 1973); Friebus, 1977). Further, college supervisors seem to agree: in Koehler's (1984) study, all of the university supervisors who were interviewed stated that the cooperating teacher was the most important person in the student teaching experience.

Concern has been expressed, however, about the effects of the cooperating teacher on student teachers. As Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1983) have pointed out, experience in and of itself is not necessarily a good teacher. And since cooperating teachers (as well as the university supervisors) are more oriented toward the practical and particular rather than theory and generalizations (Koehler, 1984; O'Neal, 1983), student teachers may not learn the more general principles from their experience that will allow them to adjust to different classroom

situations. Further, Griffin et al's (1983) analysis of the feedback provided by cooperating teachers indicates that the student teachers received very little evaluation of behavior or statements of reasons for doing what was suggested. The discussions were highly situation specific, and focussed on an individual student or problem in the particular classroom. Cooperating teachers and university supervisors saw little relationship between what was learned during the college pedagogical courses and student teaching, and research was very seldom mentioned as a basis for a prescription.

Several researchers have pointed out that student teachers are not quite a malleable and manipulated as has been suggested by Friebus (1977) and others. Tabachnick and Zeichner (1984) found that student teachers' perspectives did not change appreciably during the student teaching experience, but that there was a negotiation process that allowed student teachers to have some control over their socialization process. And Veldman (1970) found that student personality is a strong determinant of eventual teaching practice. Further, Doyle (1977) and Copeland (1980) concluded that it is the ecology of the school and classroom that influences both the cooperating and student teacher. The context of the school is, therefore, seen to be a powerful determinant of the cooperating teachers' behaviors and what the student teachers learn.

While the effect of the cooperating teachers may be somewhat more complex than originally thought, it is clear that their influence is extremely strong, and that they do not always provide the most effective experience for the student teachers.

Modelling and Feedback: Much less is known about what the cooperating teacher should be doing to best help the student teacher. There are clues from the literature, however, that point to two important aspects of the cooperating teacher's role: the behaviors that cooperating teachers exhibit or model, and the process and content of feedback provided to the student teacher.

Copeland (1977 & 1979) found that students who had been trained in a skill on campus would use that same skill in the classroom if his or her cooperating teacher used it or provided reinforcement to the student teacher for using it. Barnes and Edwards (1984), using the Griffin et al. (1983) data, looked at the behavior of cooperating teaching experiences and found that the effective teachers modelled the behaviors they were interested in having the student teachers attempt. Copeland (1979), providing an ecological explanation for such findings, suggested that the use of the skill by the cooperating teacher accustomed the students to it, and therefore made it easier for the student teacher to employ it. These findings suggest that transfer of skills and knowledge from the college experience to practice teaching is possible if the cooperating teacher is aware of the target skills learned in preservice and/or naturally employs them in his/her classroom.

Feedback is thought my many to be the essential ingredient in the student teaching experience (for example, O'Neal, 1983;

Copeland, 1981). Without feedback, the student will not learn effectively from experience (Feiman-Nemser and Buchman, 1983). Copeland (1981) stated: "central to the success of skill practice in clinical experiences must be the presence of another person who is able to offer specific, useful and appropriate criticism concerning the adequacy of the trainee's performance" (p. 9). He went on to state that the way in which criticism is provided helps to shape the student teacher behaviors.

Several studies have examined the feedback of supervisors and found it lacking in substance, criticism and depth. Blumberg and Cusick (1979) found that the supervisees' legitimate complaints were never dealt with, that the bulk of the feedback sessions revolved around procedural aspects such as scheduling, and that when the supervisees became defensive, the supervisors backed off from dealing with them. Griffin et al. (1983) found very little in clinical feedback sessions that related to the student teachers' formal pedagogical education, or to research on teaching. The feedback was particularistic and provided few explanations. Feiman-Nemser and Buchman (1985) described a case study of a student teacher who failed to learn how to develop and extend the content side of instruction because the cooperating teacher did not give her feedback on this element of her teaching.

Very little research has been conducted on effective feedback practices of cooperating teachers. There is some mixed evidence on the direct versus indirect approach to supervisory feedback (Blumberg, 1968; Vokovich, 1976; Copeland & Atkinson, 1978). And Barnes and Edwards (1984), in their comparison of the more and less effective cooperating teachers, found that the more effective ones provided clear and specific feedback to their student teachers, provided rationales for their suggestions, and exhibited self-reflection.

V SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING

How does the literature on supervision help us think about the student teaching experience? What norms govern the relationship among a student teacher, a cooperating teacher, and the university supervisor? And how can the context of the school help or inhibit the process? A participant observation study of the student teaching experience was conducted to shed some light on these questions.

This study was undertaken as part of the regular duties of a university supervisor. Fourteen student teaching experiences were observed, seven in the fall, and seven in the spring. The student teachers were in their last semester of their teacher preparation program, and student taught in four elementary schools in the Tucson area. Two of the schools were Chapter I schools, one with a significant population of black students, and one which was primarily American Indian and Hispanic. The population of the other two schools was primarily Anglo, middle and lower middle class and highly transient.

Observations were made of the cooperating teachers and student teachers. Extensive notes were taken on all observation and feedback sessions, conversations with teachers, discussions with the student teachers as a group, and three-way evaluation sessions.

The findings described here focus on the difficulty of separating the student teacher's performance from the performance of the cooperating teacher in establishing classroom routines, and the need, therefore, to establish in schools norms related to the rigorous analysis of teaching.

While evaluations of student teachers by university supervisors and cooperating teachers tend to focus on the performance of student teachers, the task structure of these routines established by the cooperating teachers in this study had a strong influence on the performance of the student teacher. They influenced student learning, and defined appropriate teacher behavior. But the relationship between routines and appropriate teaching behavior was never discussed by the cooperating and student teachers, and was perhaps not understood.

The importance of routines for student teachers became apparent on the basis of a comparison between the fall and spring experiences. The seven fall student teachers were in their schools two days before school started. They were able to observe the opening days and the establishment of classroom routines. In large part, they were unclear about what was happening. They felt that very little teaching was occurring during the first several weeks, and the extensive experimentation with grouping for math and reading mystified them. While they were privy to the cooperating teachers' plans, and often their thinking aloud, they had no way of placing what was happening within a set of constructs called routines. In addition, they themselves were an added component in the teachers' planning of routines. Most of the fall cooperating teachers organized their classrooms on the basis of there being two adults in the classroom: more groups were formed, and more centers were developed.

The cooperating teachers did not talk about establishing routines. They did talk about "getting the kids to work with each other in centers", and other socializing goals. They relied on the student teachers' observations skills. This was stated explicitly by the two team teachers in a "developmental" classroom of 56 students. They stated to me and the student teachers: "It looks like chaos, but there is an underlying structure. If you watch long enough you will see it". No attempt was made to <u>describe</u> the structure. The student teachers were confused, partly because of the evolving nature of the structure, and partly because no one seemed able to describe the structure to them. They therefore had neither categories nor vocabulary to understand the structures and the goals and beliefs of the teachers in organizing that classroom. One of the cooperating teachers was, in fact, quite articulate about teaching and was very perceptive about her student teacher's

approach. She did not discuss these with her student teacher because of her strongly held belief that teachers "learn by experience".

Eventually, the student teachers mimicked the language of the cooperating teachers and explained to me that the structure was there, all I had to do was observe it. They couldn't describe it very well, but I sensed that they had developed a tacit understanding of it. They learned to work within the routines, and to ignore the complexity surrounding them. Unfortunately, the routines that they understood were based on the availability of twice as many adults in the classroom than they will have when they start to teach.

A more difficult time was experienced by a student teacher in a Grade 1 classroom. The establishment of routines in Grade 1 is particularly important and difficult. Her exceptionally gifted cooperating teacher was teaching Grade 1 for the first time, and experimenting with various routines. She could not describe to her student teacher what she was doing or what she wanted her student teacher to do. Her student teacher, who had no understanding of the relationship between appropriate behavior and routines would mimic her cooperating teachers' management behaviors during inappropriate routines. She experienced massive and disruptive failures. She became bitter and angry at the students. Her perplexed cooperating teacher could not help her. She tried to explain the failures in terms of "timing"--"there was a magic quiet moment when you should have started to teach"; or resorted to the old adage: "some things work for some people but not for others".

In the spring, routines were well established and operated smoothly in all of the seven new classrooms. Students had been socialized into the routines, knew both what to expect and the appropriate behaviors for each routine. The organization of the classrooms operated as a type of laboratory experience for the students teachers. They could and did concentrate on specific skills such as questioning, wait time, transitions and planning units. Unfortunately, they did not have the opportunity to develop even an intuitive understanding of routines and how to establish them. While I asked student teachers to think about how such routines would be established, and asked cooperating teachers to talk about the bases upon which they established or changed routines, such requests merely raised the anxiety levels of the student teachers. Cooperating teachers would discount the ability of the student teachers to learn about routines from their classrooms. Many comments such as the following were made about routines: "She will have to establish their own on the basis of her personality; mine probably won't work for her;" and "routines are different every year, because the students are different". Further, the norms of individualism were strongly transmitted to the student teachers during that period of time. I commented to one teacher that I really liked her early morning routine in her Grade 1 classroom (attendance, collecting homework and notes, determining school lunch options, pledge of

allegiance). It was quick and smooth. She said that she had been teaching for fourteen years, and had finally come up with this routine. I asked her if she had sought advice or even talked to other teachers during this time about different opening routines; she was surprised with the questions and said no. I asked her if she contemplated sharing with others her new routine. She became very uncomfortable and said she couldn't do that. I probed, and she added that she would be viewed as presumptuous if she did that.

As a university supervisor, I could have been the person to help all of us understand what was going on in the classroom. However, like the long-time supervisors in the Griffin, et. al. (1983) study (see Koehler, 1984), I felt that I was not really affecting the student teacher very much, at least in comparison with the cooperating teacher. I therefore began to describe my role as that of supervising a process, rather than the student teacher. Short observations and feedback sessions once every two weeks do not constitute adequate supervision, particularly clinical supervision. I was in and out of the school as well as the classrooms, and therefore was not a part of either.

Further, I found that there were extremely awkward aspects of the clinical role with respect to the cooperating teacher. Focussing on such student teacher behaviors such as interaction, transitions, or the lesson components of set, conclusion, etc., is safe, but does not help the student teacher place such behaviors within the context of the particular classroom conditions and the routines. However, a discussion of routines constitutes a potential criticism of the cooperating teacher's performance. The student teachers' responses to such discussions invariably was: "well, but that's how she does it". Ideally, such dialogue should go on, often, among the triad: student and cooperating teacher and university supervisor. Given the structure of university supervision and the organization of schools, such is impossible. Therefore, I found myself attempting to help the students think about routines and their relationships to behaviors; but the sessions were too short, as were the two sessions for each student teacher when the three of us got together. An honest, trusting three-way conversation would have taken extensive work and time.

The norms in the schools in which the students taught did not lend themselves to rigorous analysis of teaching and colleagial support. Few teachers had ever observed or been observed by another teacher. The teachers viewed differences in teaching behavior as attributable to personality and the specific students in a class. Several teachers did rely on others for materials and learning center ideas, but not for help with problems. And the discourse between the student teachers and the cooperating teachers reflected these norms. The feedback provided to the student teachers by the cooperating teachers was particularistic, and not tied to research generalizations. The student teachers were learning that each classroom and teacher is unique, that each teacher has to rely on trial and error, and the

criterion of success is "what feels right to the individual teacher".

VI DISCUSSION: IMPROVEMENT OF THE STUDENT TEACHING EXPERIENCE

The preservice teacher education literature suggests that student teaching is the most important aspect of the experience. Two areas suggested by the literature which contribute to the success of the student teaching experience are the cooperating teachers' feedback and his or her instructional behaviors. The feedback should be clear, with specific suggestions and examples accompanied by rationales for their suggestions. The cooperating teacher behaviors should model those that the student teachers are attempting to practice. The modelling may be important as Copeland (1979) suggested because the classroom students already know the routines and are able to perform for the student teachers. This would seem to be the case for the student teachers in the Spring sample. As long as they worked within the routines established by the teachers with no surprises for the students, the students cooperated. A few out-of-place or different behaviors on the part of the student teachers, and immediate management problems developed.

Cooperating teachers could (and undoubtedly have been) be trained in a Hunter-type supervision program designed to provide a step-by-step procedure for analyzing teaching behavior and providing feedback. Such a system may be effective in helping student teachers with specific management behaviors and lesson design and implementation. However, beyond an initial trial, such a system may not provide the cooperating teacher with a sense of growth, an ability to adapt, reflect and self-criticize.

The need for an articulate and consciously reflective cooperating teacher is evident from the study. As indicated in the second example above, an effective teacher is not necessarily able to communicate the deep structure of his/her decisions and procedures to the student. This can lead to a great sense of frustration and classroom management problems for the student teachers.

It is also clear that in order to help the student teacher understand the relationship between behaviors and routines in a specific context, the cooperating teacher needs to be able to reflect upon and perhaps criticize his or her own classroom routines. Cooperating teachers need to analyse and articulate the ways in which their students have been socialized into the classroom routines and the effect of this socialization on the student teacher's performance.

Generally speaking, the university supervisor cannot provide the missing link in this equation. If the university supervisor is a graduate student, s/he is caught between the demands of college and the student teachers. The university supervisor who is a faculty member is between school buildings and on campus participating in faculty activities and teaching other courses most of the time. The rare (once every two weeks) appearances in

the classroom do not lend themselves to the type of trust-building necessary for a collaborative, reflective feedback session.

Several teacher education programs are structured so as to produce reflective teachers (for example, Zeichner & Liston, 1985; Korthagen, 1985; Adler & Roth, 1985). Again, these programs focus on the student teacher and the university supervisor, rather than on the cooperating teacher. And unless the nature of the university supervisor's role radically changes, this focus will probably not change the nature of student teaching.

Can cooperating teachers, working independently, be articulately self-reflective, and be willing to explore and perhaps criticize their own performance while helping student teachers? It is, indeed, a rare event given the norms of school faculties, and teachers' lack of training in and practice with rigorous analysis of teaching. McKay and Marland (1978) suggest that for teachers to distance themselves from the conplexity and simultaneity of classroom events is a difficult process. Ward (1985) found that only one-third of the teachers with whom she and Tickunoff have worked think about their teaching in terms of cause and effect.

We must, then, revisit Blumberg's (1980) assertion that one-on-one supervision has no future; that we should focus, on improvement as a school-wide effort. It may not be necessary, however to discard one-on-one supervision, but consider such a process within a larger school improvement context. Supervision will always imply, as Bird (1984) has suggested, a relationship between two people, one of whom as been conferred with status. For effective supervision to take place, it must take place in a context that rewards reflection and critical analysis of teaching and has broken the "independence" norms. We should then consider student teaching as a school-wide responsibility that is part and parcel of a school improvement effort. One student teacher within one classroom should no longer be the unit of analysis for a placement decision. We should think, instead about clustering student teachers within the types of schools described by Bird and Little in which the norms for improvement, reflective teaching and critical analysis of teaching are strong. And if these schools do not exist (and since very few do exist, this is a definite possibility), the efforts of the college and university supervisors should be directed at helping local school districts and school principals create the context, skills and incentives necessary for such schools to exist.

As with most solutions in education, each has its own problems. Little (Forthcoming) points out that in the improving schools that she observed, new teachers were at a definite disadvantage. The faculties shared a vocabulary, had worked extensively together, and had established a trust level such that conversations, group meetings, etc. employed some shorthand procedures that left the new teachers in the dark. Such would also be the case for student teachers. These schools would

therefore have to reorganize, somewhat, to permit the new and student teachers access to the shared understandings. If the improving schools understood their role not only as reflective and self-renewing, but also as places for new and student teachers to become socialized into such settings, they would become ideal places for student teaching, and could, thereby, achieve the goal of helping to empower the teaching profession through well educated and socialized new teachers.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. and Gall, M. (1980). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. New York: Longman.

Adler, S. & Roth, R. (1985). Critical inquiry in teacher preparation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association, Chicago, Ill.

Alfonso, R., Firth, G., & Neville, R. (1981). Instructional behavior system, 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1981.

Baker, R.G. & Showers, B. (1984). The effects of a coaching strategy on teachers' transfer of training to classroom practice: a six-month follow-up study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association. New Orleans.

Barnes, S. & Edwards, S. Effective student teaching experience: a qualitative-quantitative study. Report No. 9060. Austin, Texas: research and Development Center for Teacher Education, University of texas.

Bird, T. (1984). Propositions regarding the analysis and supervision of teaching. Speach delivered to the Loveland, Colorado School Administrators Workshop, Vail, Colorado.

Blumberg, A. (1980). Supervisors and teachers: a private cold war. 2nd ed. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.

Blumberg, A. & Cusick, P. (Nov.,1970). Supervisor-teacher interactions: an analysis of verbal behavior. Education, 91, 126-134.

Brimfield, R. & Leonard, R. (1983). The student teaching experience: a time to consolidate one's perceptions. College Student Journal, 17, 401-406.

Copeland, W.D. (1977). Some factors related to student teacher classroom performance following microteaching training. American Educational research Journal, 14, 147-157.

Copeland, W.D. (1979). Student teachers and cooperating teachers:

an ecological relationship. Theory into practice, 18 (8), 194-199.

Copeland, W.D. (1981). Clinical experiences in the education of teachers. Journal of education for teaching, 8 (1), 5-16.

Copeland, W.D. & Atkinson, D.R. (1978). Student teacher's perceptions of directive and nondirective supervisory behavior. Journal of educational research, 712 (3), 123-127.

Davies, D. & Amarsheck, K. (1969). Student teaching. Encyclopedia of educational research, 4th ed. Ebel, R.L. (Ed.). MacMillan Co. Collier MacMillan, Ltd., London.

Doyle, E. (1977). Learning the classroom environment: an ecological analysis. Journal of teacher education. 28, 51-55.

Eaker, R. (1972). An analysis of the clinical supervision process as perceived by selected teachers and administrators. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Tennessee.

Feiman-Nemser, S. & Buchman, M. (1985). On what is learned in student teaching: appraising the experience. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of teacher Education. Chicago, Ill.

Friebus, R. (1977). Agents of socialization in student teaching. Journal of educational research, 7, 263-268.

Fuchs, E. (1969). Teachers talk: views from inside city schools. Garden City: N.J.: Doubleday.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical supervision: Special methods for the supervision of teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Goldhammer, R., Anderson, R.H. & Krajewski, R.J. (1980). Clinical Supervision of teachers: Special methods for the supervision of teachers, 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Glatthorn, A. (1984). Differentiated supervision. Alexandria., Va.: American Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Defino, M. Edwards, S., Hukill, H., & O'Neal, S. (1983). Clinical preservice teacher education: final report of a descriptive study. Austin, Texas: the University of Texas, research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Haberman, M. (1983). research on preservice lab and clinical

experiences. The education of teachers. Howey, K. & Gardner, W. (Eds.) New York: Longman.

Hull, R., et al. (1982). Research on student teaching: a question of transfer. Report of a research seminar conducted at the University of Oregon. Eugene, Oregon: Division of Teacher Education.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (Feb.,1980). Improving inservice training: the message of research. Educational Leadership, 37, 379-385.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (Spring, 1981). Transfer of training: the contribution of coaching. Journal of Education, 163, 163-172.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (Oct.,1982). The coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 40, pp. 4-10.

Harris, B. (1975). Supervisory behavior in education, 2rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Hunter, M. (Feb., 1980). Six types of supervisory conferences. Educational Leadership, 408-412.

Kmetz, J.T. & Willower, D.J. (1982). Elementary school principals' work behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly. 18.

Koehler, V. (1984). University Supervision of student teaching. Report No. 9061. Austin, Texas: University of texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Korthagen, F. (1985). Reflective thinking as a basis for teacher education. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill.

Little, J. (1981). The power of organizational settings: school norms and staff development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association, Los Angeles. (ED 221 918).

Little, J.W. & Bird, T. (1983). Finding and founding peer coaching: an interim report of the application of research on faculty relations to the implementation of two school improvement experiments. Boulder, Colorado: Center for Action research. (ED 238 141).

Little, J.W. (In Press). Teachers as colleagues. In Koehler, V. Educators handbook: A research perspective. New York: Longman.

Lucio, W. & McNeil, J. (1979). Supervision: a synthesis of thought and action, 3rd ed. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mackay, D. & Marland, P. (1978). Thought processes of teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association, Toronto.

Martin, W. & Willower, D. (1981, Winter). The managerial behavior of high school principals. Educational Administration Quarterly, 17, 69-90.

McFaul, S. & Cooper, J. (April, 1984) Peer clinical supervision: theory vs. reality. Educational Leadership. 41 (2), 4-9.

Metz, M. (1978). Classrooms and corridors: the crisis of authority in deseqreqated secondary schools. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Morrisey, J. (1980). A review: factors that affect cooperating teachers' role and responsibilities in internship. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED218-219.

Neagley, R. & Evans, H. (1980). Handbook for effective supervision of instruction, 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

O'Neal, S. (1983). Supervision of student teachers: feedback and evaluation. Austin Texas: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Seperson, M.A. & Joyce, B. (!973). Teaching styles and student teachers as related to those of their cooperating teachers. Educational Leadership Research Supplement, 146-151.

Sergiovanni, T. (1976). Toward a theory of clinical supervision. Journal of research and development in education 9 (2), 20-29.

Showers, B. (1982). Transfer of training: the contribution of coaching. Final report for the National Institute of Education. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Smyth, J.W. (1984). Clinical supervision--collaborative learning about teaching. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Sullivan, C. (1980). Clinical supervision: a state of the art review. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tabachnick, B. & Zeichner, K. (1984). The impact of the student teaching experience on the development of teacher

perspectives. Journal of Teacher Education. 35 (6), 28-36.

Veldman, D. (1970). Pupil evaluation of student teachers and their supervisors. Journal of Teacher Education. 21, 165-167.

Vokovich, D. (1976). The effects of four specific supervision procedures on the development of evaluation skills in preservice teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 146 224).

Ward, B. (1985). Teacher development : the challenge of the future. In Hord, S., O'Neal, S., & Smith, M. (Eds.). Beyond the looqinq qlass. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for teacher Education.

Yee, A.H. (1969). Do cooperating teachers influence the attitudes of student teachers? Journal of Educational Psychology, 60 (4), 327-332.

Zeichner, K. (1980). Myths and realities: field-based experiences in preservice teacher education. Journal of teacher Education, 31 (6), 45-46.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1985). Theory and practice in the evolution of an inquiry-oriented student teachinq program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational research Association, Chicago, Ill.